

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application.

I. Objection to Drawings

The Office Action objects to Figs. 8 and 9. Figs 8 and 9 have been labeled as "related art" to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Figs. 8 and 9 is respectfully requested.

II. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over McKechnie (U.S. Patent No. 4,730,897); rejects claims 3-5 under U.S.C. §103(a) over McKechnie in view of Goto 1 (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0137729), and rejects claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(A) over McKechnie in view of Goto 2 (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,855). The rejections are respectively traversed.

In particular, neither McKechnie, Goto 1 nor Goto 2, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests a transmissive screen including a microlens array portion... and a light diffusing portion disposed between a Fresnel lens portion and the microlens array portion, as recited in independent claim 1.

McKechnie instead discloses at Fig. 2 a bulk diffuser element 24 between Fresnel lens 29 and lenticulars 28. Specifically, McKechnie does not disclose or suggest a microlens array portion. Since McKechnie uses lenticulars, McKechnie's disclosure is not the same as what is recited in the claims because the claims recite a microlens array portion. More specifically, in lenticulars, a horizontal direction viewing angle is expanded. Therefore, it is necessary to install a diffusion zone to secure a viewing angle in a vertical direction. McKechnie does not pertain to constraining of the generation of diffracted light in the microlens array portion, which is performed by providing the light diffusing portion. In summary, McKechnie does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1.

Neither Goto 1 nor Goto 2 make up for the above noted deficiencies of McKechnie.

Goto 1 discloses in Fig. 2b a lenticular lens sheet 21 where the lenticular lens 22 are arranged on a back side surface facing a Fresnel lens sheet 11 (see paragraph [0050]). Goto 2 discloses in Fig. 1a a rear projection screen in which a lenticular lens sheet is used. In summary, both Goto 1 and Goto 2 have the same deficiencies as McKechnie.

Therefore, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 2-9 depend from independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection based on Double-Patenting

The Office Action further rejects claim 1 under provisional obviousness-type double patenting over claim 4 of co-pending Application No. 10/647,302. Applicants will address this issue at the time the claims are in condition for allowance and the provisional obviousness-type double patenting exists.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/eks

Attachment:
Replacement Sheets

Date: August 11, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE. AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
